

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
08/932,543	09/17/1997	YASUSHI KAWAKURA	1701.39203	1701.39203 5429	
	7590 11/19/2002				
JOSEPH M POTENZA			EXAMINER		
BANNER & V	ET NW		TRAN, HAI V		
WASHINGIC	N, DC 200014597		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			2611		
DATE		DATE MAILED: 11/19/2002			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	08/932,543	KAWAKURA ET AL	•
, . <b></b>	Examiner	Art Unit	
·	Hai Tran	2611	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 05 November 2002 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The see have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the context o	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF The date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection.  R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final	on. See MPEP  opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's     37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	Brief must be filed within the per R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
<ol><li>The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be</li></ol>	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) _ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
<ul><li>(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
<ul><li>(d)  they present additional claims without canceling</li><li>NOTE: .</li></ul>	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	S.
B. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	on(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5.  ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims wo			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:	•		
Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a	a) approved or b) disapp	roved by the Examir	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	•	
0. Other:	ANDE	REW FAILE	
	SUPERVISORY	PATENT EXAMINER	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-303 (Rev. 04-01) TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Advisory Action Part of Paper No. 10





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Pinder, art of record, does teach a plurality of processing units as required in the instant claims 5-8, 10-13 and 15-18. Pinder's Fig. 2B clearly shows a plurality of processing units 234, 236 and 238 are used to decode an encrypted multi-session key (Col. 7, lines 4-22). Thus, Pinder clearly encompasses the claimed limitation "a plurality of processing units configured to respectively execute different operations on the decoded data".